



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,643	09/07/2006	Siebe Tjerk De Zwart	2004P03060WOUS	8437
24737 7590 12/08/2011 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			EXAMINER MATTHEWS, ANDRE L	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 12/08/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com
debbie.henn@philips.com
marianne.fox@philips.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/598,643

Applicant(s)

DE ZWART ET AL.

Examiner

ANDRE MATTHEWS

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/07/2011.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/20/2011 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10, and 11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodgate (US 5, 808,792) in view of Allen (US 6,888,540) and Steiner (US 2002/0063914).

3. Regarding claims 1 and 10, Woodgate teaches a multiview display device (600) (**display 2**) for displaying multiple views, the multiple views having respective viewing

Art Unit: 2629

angles related to an object to be displayed, the display device comprising: optical device(**Fig.7-8, teaches the light generating sources 41, 50, 54, and 57 and lenses 47, 52, 56, and 59**), configured to display multiple viewing cones (**figs. 2-5; lobes -1, 0, and +1**), a first cone (**lobe 0**)of the multiple viewing cones comprises different views so that a different view is observed by a right eye and a left eye of a viewer of the multiview display device, the different views of the first cone(**Col. 5 lines 39-62**) having an angular distribution relative to the display device(**Fig. 3**) ; and providing the optical means with sets of image data corresponding to the respective views (**Fig. 4 respective views A-G**), whereby the sets of image data are provided such that (**Col 5 lines 39-60; teaches that windows are updated to show the respective Right and Left views of the image to form a complete autostereoscopic image**): the angular distribution has a first part of adjacent views with increasing viewing angle and a second part of adjacent views with decreasing viewing angle(**Figs. 3-5, windows 1-3, as shown in Fig. 3 the convergence point B' would be the increase viewing angle and the edge points of A' and C' would be the decreased viewing angles**) ; and the angular distribution has a first one of the views in between a maximum view which corresponds to a maximum viewing angle and a minimum view which corresponds to a minimum viewing angle (**Figs. 3-5, windows 1-3 views A-G**), and although Woodgate teaches a buffer and controller means (which could be considered a driver means) for determining the correct viewing data fig. 11, he does not explicitly teach it is done by a processor configured to provide the optical device with image data.

However in the same field providing an autostereoscopic display and driving method Allen teaches an autostereoscopic processor (**display driver components**) where the graphics accelerator, buffer (**43**) and the display driver (**56**), deliver image data to the display 58.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the autostereoscopic display and driving method of viewing angles taught by Woodgate and the autostereoscopic driving method taught by Allen. This combination would provide a display in which the observer has a greatly enhanced freedom of lateral movement by updating image representing different stereoscopic viewing directions as taught by Woodgate (**Col. 2 lines 56-64**). The combination of Woodgate and Allen teach the limitations as discussed above but they fail to explicitly teach a difference between viewing angles of adjacent views belonging to two different adjacent viewing cones is minimized.

However in same field of producing holographic images, Steiner teaches a system and method for creating an image where a difference between viewing angles of adjacent views belonging to two different adjacent viewing cones is minimized (**Fig.9 with reference to detailed description of Fig. 8, [0047-0051]; teaches how the angular separation of the beams is used to produce a uniform luminance function of viewing angles**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the autostereoscopic display and driving method of viewing angles taught by Woodgate and the autostereoscopic driving method taught by Allen

Art Unit: 2629

and the method of combining separate beams to create a uniform viewing angle as taught by Steiner. This combination would increase the viewing range of adequate luminance as taught by Steiner ([0051]).

4. Regarding claim 2, Woodgate teaches whereby the first part of adjacent views comprises a first number of views and the second part comprises a second number of views, a difference between the first number and the second number being minimal (**Figs. 3-5, windows 1-3 views A-G, lobes -1, 0, and +1**).

5. Regarding claim 3, Woodgate teaches whereby the first part of adjacent views comprises a first number of views and the second part comprises a second number of views, the first number being higher than the second number but being lower than four times the second number(**Figs. 3-5, windows 1-3 views A-G, lobes -1, 0, and +1**).

6. Regarding claim 4, Woodgate teaches whereby the first part of adjacent views comprises a first number of views and the second part comprises a second number of views, the first number being higher than the second number, whereby a portion of the sets of image data corresponding to one or more of the adjacent views with decreasing viewing angle has been blurred (**Col. 11 lines 14-36**).

7. Regarding claim 5, Woodgate teaches whereby a portion of the sets of image data is blurred, the amount of blur being applied to the adjacent views being related to the viewing angle (**Col. 11 lines 14-36**).

8. Regarding claim 6, Woodgate teaches whereby a first one of the sets of image data corresponding to a second one of the views which belongs to the first, also

corresponds to a third one of the views which belongs to the second part(**Figs. 3-5, windows 1-3 views A-G, lobes -1, 0, and +1**).

9. Regarding claim 7, Woodgate teaches whereby providing the sets of image data such that the first one of the multiple viewing cones has the angular distribution at a first moment in time and has a further angular distribution at a second moment in time, the further angular distribution being different from the angular distribution (**Figs. 3-5, windows 1-3 views A-G, lobes -1, 0, and +1**) and Allen teaches a processor configured to supply image data (**display driver components**) where the **graphics accelerator, buffer (43) and the display driver (56)**.

10. Regarding claim 8, Woodgate teaches comprising a shot-cut detector being arranged in order to switch between the angular distribution and the further angular distribution on basis of a detected shot-cut in the image data (**Figs. 3-5, windows 1-3 views A-G, lobes -1, 0, and +1, Fig. 11 and the respective description teaches a tracking system which determines the available viewing angle of the observer and adjust accordingly.**) and Allen teaches a processor configured to supply image data (**display driver components**) where the **graphics accelerator, buffer (43) and the display driver (56)**.

11. Regarding claim 9, Woodgate teaches comprising further optical device configured to display further viewing cones(**Fig.7-8, teaches the light generating sources 41, 50, 54, and 57 and lenses 47, 52, 56, and 59**), a second one of the further multiple viewing cones having a second angular distribution of the views relative

Art Unit: 2629

to the display device being substantially different from the angular distribution(**Figs. 3-5, windows 1-3 views A-G, lobes -1, 0, and +1**).

12. Regarding claim 11, Woodgate teaches a multiview display device for displaying multiple views, the multiple views having respective viewing angles related to an object to be displayed, the display device comprising: optical device configured to display (**Fig.7-8, teaches the light generating sources 41, 50, 54, and 57 and lenses 47, 52, 56, and 59**), multiple viewing cones (**figs. 2-5; lobes -1, 0, and +1**), a first cone (**lobe 0**) of the multiple viewing cones comprises different views so that a different view is observed by a right eye and a left eye of a viewer of the multiview display device, the different views of the first cone(**lobe 0**) having an angular distribution of the views relative to the display device(**Fig. 3**) ; and providing the optical means with sets of image data corresponding to the respective views (**Fig. 4 respective views A-G**), whereby the sets of image data are provided such that (**Col 5 lines 39-60; teaches that windows are updated to show the respective Right and Left views of the image to form a complete autostereoscopic image**): the angular distribution has a first part of adjacent views with increasing viewing angle and a second part of adjacent views with decreasing viewing angle(**Figs. 3-5, windows 1-3, as shown in Fig. 3 the convergence point B' would be the increase viewing angle and the edge points of A' and C' would be the decreased viewing angles**) ; and the angular distribution (630) has a first one of the views in between a maximum view which corresponds to a maximum viewing angle and a minimum view which corresponds to a minimum viewing angle (**Figs. 3-5, windows 1-3 views A-G**), and although Woodgate teaches a buffer

Art Unit: 2629

and controller means (which could be considered a driver means) for determining the correct viewing data fig. 11, he does not explicitly teach it is done by a driving means driving means that receives image data loaded from a computer program product processed by a computer arrangement comprising a processor and a memory.

However in the same field providing an autostereoscopic display and driving method Allen teaches an autostereoscopic display driver that receives image data loaded from a computer program product processed by a computer arrangement comprising a processor, a memory, and a driver **(where the graphics accelerator, buffer (43) and the display driver (56), deliver the data to the display 58, memory 41).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the autostereoscopic display and driving method of viewing angles taught by Woodgate and the autostereoscopic driving method taught by Allen. This combination would provide a display in which the observer has a greatly enhanced freedom of lateral movement by updating image representing different stereoscopic viewing directions as taught by Woodgate **(Col. 2 lines 56-64)**. The combination of Woodgate and Allen teach the limitations as discussed above but they fail to explicitly teach a difference between viewing angles of adjacent views belonging to two different adjacent viewing cones is minimized.

However in same field of producing holographic images, Steiner teaches a system and method for creating an image where a difference between viewing angles of adjacent views belonging to two different adjacent viewing cones is minimized **(Fig.9**

with reference to detailed description of Fig. 8, [0047-0051]; teaches how the angular separation of the beams is used to produce a uniform luminance function of viewing angles).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the autostereoscopic display and driving method of viewing angles taught by Woodgate and the autostereoscopic driving method taught by Allen and the method of combining separate beams to create a uniform viewing angle as taught by Steiner. This combination would increase the viewing range of adequate luminance as taught by Steiner ([0051]).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDRE MATTHEWS whose telephone number is (571)270-5806. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on 571-272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANDRE MATTHEWS
Examiner
Art Unit 2629

/Amr Awad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629